

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 035 706

UD 009 498

AUTHOR Kaye, Mildred
TITLE College Discovery and Development Tutorial Program, 1967-68. Research Report.
INSTITUTION City Univ. of New York, N.Y. Div. of Teacher Education.
REPORT NO ORE-68-14
PUB DATE Oct 68
NOTE 38p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement, College Students, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Federal Programs, High School Students, Individualized Instruction, Negro Students, Puerto Ricans, Self Concept, *Tutoring, *Work Study Programs
IDENTIFIERS City University of New York, CUNY, OEO, *Office of Economic Opportunity

ABSTRACT

Financed by the College Work Study Program (administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity), college students who were largely from lower-class homes, tutored in the College Discovery and Development (CDDP) High School Centers in New York City. The tutors, recruited from the City University of New York (CUNY) system had, on the whole, a beneficial effect on the disadvantaged high school students as academic achievement, aptitude and self-esteem in the latter group improved. Appended are results of the Tutor Opinion Questionnaire given to participating tutors. [Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of the original document.] (KG)

Library



DIVISION OF TEACHER EDUCATION OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
535 EAST 80TH STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. 10021

DEC 3 1969

Office of Research and Evaluation
RESEARCH REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

09498 E

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

68-14

COLLEGE DISCOVERY AND DEVELOPMENT

TUTORIAL PROGRAM

1967-68

by

Mildred Kaye, Lecturer
Assistant to the Director
College Discovery and Development Program

OCTOBER, 1968

ED035706

UD 009498

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION.....	1
SELECTION AND SUPERVISION OF TUTORS.....	2
ANALYSIS OF TUTOR LOGS.....	3
ANALYSIS OF TUTOR OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE.....	10
SUGGESTIONS FOR 1968-69.....	23
SUMMARY.....	24
APPENDICES.....	25
A. FINANCIAL REPORT.....	26
B. TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE.....	31

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	NUMBER OF TUTORS EMPLOYED IN EACH CDD CENTER DURING THE ACADEMIC YEAR 1967-68.....	4
II	NUMBER AND PER CENT OF STUDENTS TUTORED IN EACH CDD CENTER, 1967-68.....	5
III	NUMBER OF STUDENTS TUTORED IN EACH CDD CENTER ACCORDING TO MONTH OF YEAR.....	7
IV	NUMBER OF TUTOR HOURS IN EACH CDD CENTER ACCORDING TO MONTH OF YEAR.....	8
V	NUMBER OF TUTORING HOURS IN EACH SUBJECT AREA IN EACH CDD CENTER, 1967-68.....	9
VI	AVERAGE NUMBER OF STUDENTS TUTORED PER SESSION.....	13
VII	NUMBER OF TUTORS WHO STATED STUDENTS ATTENDED SESSIONS REGULARLY	14
VIII	TIME OF DAY TUTORING SESSIONS WERE CONDUCTED.....	15
IX	LOCATION OF TUTORING SESSIONS.....	16
X	NATURE OF TUTORING SESSIONS.....	17
XI	MATERIALS USED DURING TUTORING SESSIONS.....	18
XII	ADEQUACY OF SUPERVISION REPORTED BY TUTORS.....	19
XIII	TUTOR CONTACT WITH CLASSROOM TEACHERS.....	20
XIV	NUMBER OF TUTORS WHO WERE INFORMED ABOUT NATURE OF REGULAR LESSONS BY CLASSROOM TEACHERS.....	21
XV	NUMBER OF TUTORS WHO HAD COPIES OF CLASSROOM TEXTBOOKS.....	22
XVI	NUMBER OF STUDENTS EMPLOYED, 1967-68.....	27
XVII	COLLEGE WORK-STUDY PROGRAM PAYROLL, 1967-68.....	28
XVIII	DISTRIBUTION BY FAMILY INCOME LEVELS OF TUTOR EARNINGS, 1967-68	29
XIX	DISTRIBUTION BY FAMILY INCOME LEVELS OF STUDENT AIDE EARNINGS, 1967-68.....	30

INTRODUCTION

The tutoring of disadvantaged high school youth by college students who, themselves, were from low-income families, was designed to serve the public interest in many significant and unique ways. College students helped high school youths overcome some of the educational handicaps imposed by an environment of socio-economic deprivation. The tutoring project helped disadvantaged youth improve their aptitude and achievement, raise their self-esteem, and heighten their educational and vocational aspirations. The tutoring project helped students use their personal potential more productively by developing better study skills; improve their ability to understand and to meet school requirements; identify with their tutor-mentors who, although themselves from economically needy backgrounds, were college students in good standing; and to engage the talents of these youth who otherwise would join the ranks of the school dropouts.

The following report covers the period from September 1967 to June 1968. It was not designed to pass judgment on the success or failure of the program but to present the facts and figures as they were collected throughout the school year.

SELECTION AND SUPERVISION OF TUTORS

Under the College Work-Study Program administered by the United States Office of Economic Opportunity, a grant was secured allowing college students from the City University to be assigned as tutors in the five College Discovery and Development High School centers. The college students were selected on the basis of economic need and satisfactory academic standing in college.

Tutors were selected from among full-time students in attendance at one of the sixteen CUNY colleges. Initial screening of the tutor applicant was provided by the student personnel officers at the various CUNY campuses, then by the tutor coordinator. Recommendations from faculty members were secured. Final decisions were left to the individual school coordinator since he best knew the needs of his students.

Most of the college-student tutors themselves came from low income families. Many were preparing for careers in teaching. The systematic tutoring of disadvantaged high school youth within the high school setting provided experiences that were directly related to the educational objective of many of the college-student tutors.

Orientation meetings were conducted at the beginning of the academic year at all five high school centers. During the year, the program was administered in each CDD center on a regularly scheduled basis during the school day by the high school coordinator under the general leadership of the CDD tutor coordinator. While college-student tutors worked with disadvantaged high school boys and girls primarily on class assignments and remedial work (including reading, composition, mathematics, etc.), tutors also served in a variety of other ways designed to individualize and enrich instruction.

ANALYSIS OF TUTOR LOGS

During the academic year 1967-68, tutors were required to keep logs of all their sessions with their assigned tutees. They recorded the names of the students with whom they met, the day and time of meeting, the subject in which the students were tutored, the nature of the sessions and the materials used. Table I to V summarize the data from each center and for the five centers combined.

Table I shows the number of tutors employed during each month of the academic year at each CDD center. The unduplicated number, 213, appears in the last column. The number of tutors employed increased appreciably at center I and II during the latter part of the year, March through May. The others remained rather constant in their use of tutors throughout the school year. The turnover rate among tutors was approximately 19 per cent each month.

TABLE I

NUMBER OF TUTORS EMPLOYED IN EACH CDD CENTER
DURING THE ACADEMIC YEAR 1967-68

Center	<u>Number of Tutors Employed Each Month</u>										Unduplicated Number of Tutors
	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	April	May	June	
I	1	16	40	41	33	32	45	46	45	33	71
II	1	13	14	14	12	25	26	25	23	17	37
III	0	8	13	12	11	14	16	16	15	9	29
IV	1	29	36	37	37	26	28	26	27	25	46
V	0	19	19	20	13	21	19	18	18	0	30
TOTAL	3	85	122	124	106	118	134	131	128	84	213

According to Table II a total of 776 students (unduplicated number) were tutored in the period from September 1967 to June 1968. The total average enrollment in the CDD program was 1139. The 776, therefore, represents 68.12 per cent of the entire CDD student population.

TABLE II

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF STUDENTS TUTORED IN EACH
CDD CENTER, 1967-68

Center	Average CDD Enrollment	Number of Students Tutored	Per cent of Students Tutored
I	222	196	88.28
II	265	132	49.81
III	237	124	52.32
IV	204	158	77.45
V	211	166	78.67
TOTAL	1139	776	68.12

It is clear that from Table III the tutoring program did not get into full swing until October. This was expected since it takes at least two or three weeks to recruit tutors, provide the necessary orientation, and arrange schedules. The varying number of students tutored each month primarily reflects the demand for assistance by the students themselves.

A total of 23,515 tutoring hours were distributed over a variety of subjects as indicated in Table IV. By a tutoring hour is meant one student receiving one hour's tutoring either individually or in a small group session. For example, three students, each receiving one hour's tutoring in French by one tutor during a study period represents three tutoring hours. It is clear that the peak months were November, March and May. These are typically mid-term and end-term examination periods.

As can be seen in Table V Geometry (5555), Algebra (Elementary, 2834; Intermediate, 2573), Spanish (5364), and French (2211) were the subjects in which most tutoring was requested and received by students in the five centers. The sciences, Biology (1569), Chemistry (931), and Earth Science (445) were also well represented in the total picture. A total of 570 tutoring hours were devoted to English, 625 hours to History, and 329 to Economics.

Elective subjects such as Physics (70), Calculus (105), and Trigonometry (223) required considerably fewer tutoring hours. Evidently only one center offered Italian as a language and 111 hours' assistance were given students in that subject area.

In summary, during the academic year September 1967 to June 1968 a total of 776 students received special assistance during 23,515 tutoring hours conducted by 213 tutors in one or more high school subject areas.

TABLE III

NUMBER OF STUDENTS TUTORED IN EACH CDD CENTER
ACCORDING TO MONTH OF YEAR

Center	<u>Number of Students Tutoed</u>										Unduplicated Number of Students Tutoed
	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	April	May	June	
I	4	36	120	128	103	87	122	111	119	125	196
II	7	72	72	70	62	91	84	76	73	59	132
III	0	26	57	56	47	60	65	61	54	38	124
IV	0	64	104	108	107	70	83	86	90	72	158
V	0	111	108	97	64	121	110	103	95	0	166
TOTAL	11	309	461	459	383	429	464	437	431	294	776

TABLE IV

NUMBER OF TUTOR HOURS* IN EACH CDD CENTER
ACCORDING TO MONTH OF YEAR

Center	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	April	May	June	Total
I	13	48	817	749	639	229	1017	851	942	805	6110
II	12	610	764	644	297	627	1071	511	951	302	5789
III	0	77	267	191	141	190	507	278	438	160	2249
IV	0	149	787	596	548	472	861	521	708	219	4861
V	0	352	746	545	121	588	904	545	705	0	4506
TOTAL	25	1236	3381	2725	1746	2106	4360	2706	3744	1486	23,515

*Tutoring Hour = one student receiving one hour's tutoring either individually or in a small group session.

TABLE V

NUMBER OF TUTORING HOURS IN EACH
SUBJECT AREA IN EACH CDD CENTER, 1967-68

Center	<u>Subject Area</u>																
	GEOM	ELEM ALG	INT ALG	CALC	TRIG	SPAN	FREN	ITAL	BIO	CHEM	EARTH SCI	PHYSICS	ENG	HIST	ECONOMICS	WORLD HIST	
I	1799	1151	827	86	0	1127	699	111	88	142	1	0	40	30	9		
II	1590	611	560	0	0	1354	843	0	178	430	0	0	131	92	0		
III	667	369	186	0	0	126	49	0	460	200	0	0	192	0	0		
IV	692	200	560	0	223	1060	620	0	254	148	24	70	188	502	320		
V	807	503	440	19	0	1697	0	0	589	11	420	0	19	1	0		
TOTAL	5555	2834	2573	105	223	5364	2211	111	1569	931	445	70	570	625	329		

ANALYSIS OF TUTOR OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

In June 1968, a questionnaire (Copy in Appendix) was designed and distributed to tap the opinions of tutors in the five CDD centers. A total of 97 or 45.55 per cent of the 213 tutors returned the completed questionnaire. During the summer the results were tallied and summarized in the following report. It should be remembered that each entry on Table VI to XV represents the response of a tutor as he or she viewed the situation. Opinions are based on personal participation, observation and interpretation during the 1967-68 academic year. Data are based on the opinions of only 45.55 per cent of the tutors.

According to Table VI, 35 tutors (36.08%) worked with an average of one student per session, 41 tutors (42.26%) worked with two students, 13 (13.40%) with three, and 8 (8.24%) worked with an average of four students per session. Although it was hoped that tutoring sessions would be conducted on a one to one basis, the demand by the students for tutoring combined with the limitations of school space, resulted in the scheduling of small group sessions. Where special problems or specific student needs warranted individual sessions, every attempt was made to provide them.

Seventy-one or 73.19 per cent of the tutors who returned the questionnaire indicated that students regularly attended tutored sessions, 26 (26.81%) reported that they did not (Table VII). In the space provided for additional comments, several tutors suggested that since they were not informed about student absences or special school assignments, they could

only conclude that missing students were just cutting the tutoring session. In conversation with several school coordinators it was learned that the tutors' conclusion that the student was cutting was often the correct interpretation. Nevertheless, it is suggested that the tutor be notified in advance if one of his tutees is absent, if at all possible.

Students were assigned tutoring sessions during study and class periods, lunch periods, before and after their regularly scheduled class hours. Five tutors indicated that they also met with students during the home room period (Table VIII).

Table IX indicates that tutors reported meeting their tutees, on the one hand, in quiet empty classrooms (53 or 54.64%), and on the other, in noisy crowded cafeterias (33 or 34.02%). The library was used by 11 tutors, and office by 18, the auditorium by 7 and the rear of an ongoing class by 4. Without doubt, finding adequate, quiet school space is a difficult problem facing most supplementary school programs. The tutoring of CDD students was no exception. The problem of space represents one of the most serious problems encountered.

As can be seen in Table X, the focus of attention during the tutoring sessions was directed towards doing homework assignments (reported by 93 of the 97 respondents). According to the tutors too much time was devoted to actually doing students homework rather than reviewing, correcting, or explaining problems. Sixty-two reported giving considerable attention to review of classwork. Studying for exams, and introduction of new work

were reported by 24 and 28 tutors, respectively. Only 4 tutors reported that several sessions were entirely devoted to "chit-chat" rather than constructive work.

Tutor comments revealed that in almost all instances, some time was spent in discussing college entrance and the more personal aspects of school life. The tutor, then, served as mentor as well as academic tutor.

Tutors used a variety of materials during the tutoring sessions. Table XI shows that textbooks, and review books were used most often. Class notes, blackboard, homework, specially prepared materials, maps and newspapers were among the other materials used throughout the year.

The majority of tutors reported adequate supervision during the school year. As can be seen in Table XII, 64 (65.97%) so indicated. The supervision was supplied by the coordinator in each center. The tutors did not, however, have much contact with the classroom teachers. Only 38 or (39.18%) of the 97 respondents claimed any sort of contact with the classroom teachers (Table XIII). Tutors main source of information about what was happening in class came from the students themselves. Only half (50 tutors) had access to copies of the classroom textbooks (Table XIV) and had them in their possession (Table XV).

TABLE VI

AVERAGE NUMBER OF STUDENTS TUTORED PER SESSION'

Center	<u>Number of Students</u>			
	One	Two	Three	Four
I	17	6	2	6
II	6	8	4	0
III	2	6	4	2
IV	9	10	2	0
V	1	11	1	0
TOTAL	35 (36.08%)	41 (42.26%)	13 (13.40%)	8 (8.24%)

TABLE VII

NUMBER OF TUTORS WHO STATED STUDENTS
ATTENDED SESSIONS REGULARLY

Center	Attended Regularly	Did Not Attend Regularly
I	18	13
II	14	4
III	9	5
IV	17	4
V	13	0
TOTAL	71 (73.19%)	26 (26.81%)

TABLE VIII

TIME OF DAY TUTORING SESSIONS WERE CONDUCTED*

Center	Class Periods	Study Periods	Lunch Periods	Before or After School Hours	Home Room Period
I	11	19	20	4	0
II	5	13	1	4	4
III	14	3	0	14	0
IV	9	11	4	8	1
V	2	11	7	5	0
TOTAL	41	57	32	35	5
PER CENT**	(42.27%)	(58.76%)	(32.99%)	(36.08%)	(5.15%)

**Per cent of 97 tutors listing category.

*Tutors listed more than one time.

TABLE IX

LOCATION OF TUTORING SESSIONS*

Center	Library	Cafeteria	Empty Classroom	Office	Auditorium	Scheduled Class
I	1	31	0	0	0	0
II	3	0	15	3	0	1
III	6	0	13	2	0	3
IV	1	0	21	1	7	0
V	0	0	4	12	0	0
TOTAL	11	33	53	18	7	4
PER CENT**	(11.34%)	(34.02%)	(54.64%)	(18.56%)	(7.22%)	(4.12%)

**Per cent of 97 tutors listing category.

*Tutors listed more than one location.

TABLE X

NATURE OF TUTORING SESSIONS*

Center	Homework	Studying for Exams	Reviewing Classwork	Introducing New Work	Talking
I	31	5	21	8	0
II	15	5	11	5	3
III	14	3	10	2	0
IV	20	6	10	10	1
V	8	5	10	3	0
TOTAL	88	24	62	28	4
PER CENT**	(90.72%)	(24.74%)	(63.92%)	(28.86%)	(4.12%)

**Per cent of 97 tutors listing category.

*Tutors listed more than one area.

TABLE XI

MATERIALS USED DURING TUTORING SESSIONS*

Center	Textbooks	Review Books	Class Notes	Blackboard	Old Tests	Homework	Specially Prepared by Tutors	Maps and Newspapers
I	24	26	6	0	1	3	1	0
II	16	18	7	1	3	1	2	0
III	11	11	3	0	4	0	1	0
IV	19	20	11	2	3	3	1	2
V	11	12	3	0	0	1	2	0
TOTAL	81	87	30	3	11	8	7	2
PER CENT**	(83.50%)	(89.69%)	(30.92%)	(3.09%)	(11.34%)	(8.24%)	(7.21%)	(2.06%)

**Per cent of 97 tutors listing category.

*Tutors listed more than one kind of material.

TABLE XII

ADEQUACY OF SUPERVISION REPORTED BY TUTORS

Center	Adequate Supervision	Inadequate Supervision	No Answer
I	22	9	0
II	12	4	2
III	6	7	1
IV	13	8	0
V	11	2	0
TOTAL	64 (65.97%)	30 (30.91%)	3 (3.12%)

TABLE XIII

TUTOR CONTACT WITH CLASSROOM TEACHERS

Center	None	Some	A Great Deal
I	27	3	1
II	6	12	0
III	3	5	6
IV	17	3	1
V	6	7	0
TOTAL	59 (60.82%)	30 (30.91%)	8 (8.27%)

TABLE XIV

NUMBER OF TUTORS WHO WERE INFORMED
ABOUT NATURE OF REGULAR LESSONS BY CLASSROOM TEACHERS

Center	Informed	Not Informed
I	17	14
II	14	4
III	10	4
IV	16	5
V	13	0
TOTAL	70 (70.71%)	27 (29.29%)

TABLE XV

NUMBER OF TUTORS WHO HAD COPIES
OF CLASSROOM TEXTBOOKS

Center	Had Textbooks	Did Not Have Textbooks
I	5	26
II	8	10
III	12	2
IV	15	6
V	10	3
TOTAL	50 (51.54%)	47 (48.46%)

SUGGESTIONS FOR 1968-69

Many of the tutors offered suggestions for improving the tutoring program. Several are listed below.

1. In order to provide the best qualified tutors, selection procedures should be more rigorous. All new applicants should be required to have a member of his college faculty submit a personal and academic recommendation.
2. Orientation procedures should be more complete. Tutors should be advised of the course curriculum in the subjects in which they will be working. Copies of the textbooks should be made available, if not for home use, at least at the CDD center. If at all possible, the tutor should have an opportunity to speak with the tutees' classroom teacher concerning the nature of the students' difficulties. Teachers' suggestions for helping the student overcome his problems would also be helpful to the tutor.
3. Regular monthly meetings of tutors and school coordinator should be scheduled to help work through any persistent problems encountered in the tutoring situation.
4. If necessary, meetings should also be scheduled between the tutor coordinator and each center coordinator.

SUMMARY

Tutoring was a relationship between a college student and a high school student, often on a one-to-one basis. The primary focus of the tutoring sessions was the improvement of basic academic skills. Unfortunately, at the present time not enough data are available to determine the significance of achievement during the past year. Achievement data will be presented in the next report.

Non-academic advantages, although impossible to quantify, at this point represent some of the program's greatest potential strengths, strengths upon which future activities can be built.

1. Tutoring put learning on a personal rather than institutional basis.
2. Tutoring afforded a student a degree of individual attention which classroom teachers often do not have a chance to provide.
3. Impressionable secondary students tended to emulate their tutors. The tutor was an older student still in school himself who attached importance to education and who was willing to assist others in its pursuit.
4. Finally, the tutoring experience generally had a constructive effect on the tutors as well as on the students.

A P P E N D I C E S

FINANCIAL REPORT

The financial data found in Tables XVI to XIX was prepared by Mr. Steven Rubin, Research Assistant, in accordance with the instructions issued under the College Work-Study Program of the Federal government.

In addition to the 213 college-student tutors, 25 college students were employed under the College Work-Study Program. They served as clerical aides in connection with the operation of the tutoring project, and 5 additional students were employed as research assistants to aid in the collection and analysis of data.

TABLE XVI

NUMBER OF STUDENTS EMPLOYED, 1967-68

	July 1, 1967 Thru Dec. 31, 1967	January 1, 1968 Thru June 30, 1968	1967-1968 Unduplicated Number	Unduplicated Number in 1967	Unduplicated Number in 1968
<u>Off Campus</u>					
I	49	64	71	49	22
II	22	34	37	22	15
III	16	26	29	16	13
IV	39	34	46	39	7
V	22	27	30	22	8
	<u>148</u>	<u>185</u>	<u>213</u>	<u>148</u>	<u>65</u>
<u>On Campus</u>					
Student Aides	<u>16</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>14</u>
TOTAL	<u>164</u>	<u>204</u>	<u>243</u>	<u>164</u>	<u>79</u>
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

Turnover Rate of Students

Tutors = 19%

Student Aides = 69%

TABLE XVII

COLLEGE WORK - STUDY PROGRAM PAYROLL, 1967-68

	Period		Total Payroll
	July 1, 1967 Thru December 31, 1967	January 1, 1968 Thru June 30, 1968	
<u>Off Campus</u>			
I	\$7,314.65	\$17,290.10	\$24,604.75
II	4,117.50	6,372.00	10,489.50
III	3,129.75	6,391.69	9,521.44
IV	4,052.25	8,693.98	12,746.23
V	4,362.75	8,581.00	12,903.75
	<u>\$22,976.90</u>	<u>\$47,288.77</u>	<u>\$70,265.67</u>
<u>On Campus</u>			
Student Aides	\$5,302.49	\$6,424.23	\$11,726.72
	<u>\$28,279.39</u>	<u>\$53,713.00</u>	<u>\$81,992.39</u>
TOTAL			

TABLE XVIII

DISTRIBUTION BY FAMILY INCOME LEVELS OF TUTOR EARNINGS, 1967-68

	<u>\$2,999 or Less</u>	<u>\$3,000 - \$5,999</u>	<u>\$6,000 - \$7,499</u>	<u>\$7,500 - \$8,999</u>	<u>\$9,000 - \$11,999</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
SENIORS (103)	\$1,547.45	\$10,043.83	\$15,031.37	\$4,381.57	\$1,523.25	\$32,527.47
JUNIORS (85)	7,428.45	10,366.92	10,245.26	2,057.26	1,413.00	31,510.89
SOPHOMORES (39)	2,435.25	4,477.05	4,987.12	942.75	364.50	13,206.67
FRESHMEN (15)	846.69	1,100.25	931.80	302.62	-	3,181.36
OTHER (1)	1,566.00	-	-	-	-	1,566.00
TOTAL (243)	\$13,823.84	\$25,988.05	\$31,195.55	\$7,684.20	\$3,300.75	\$81,992.39

TABLE XIX

DISTRIBUTION BY FAMILY INCOME LEVELS OF STUDENT AIDE EARNINGS, 1967-68

	<u>\$2,999 or Less</u>	<u>\$3,000 - \$5,999</u>	<u>\$6,000 - \$7,499</u>	<u>\$7,500 - \$8,999</u>	<u>\$9,000 - \$11,999</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
SENIORS (5)	\$ 185.08	\$ 256.20	\$ 275.20	\$1,804.20	-	\$ 2,520.68
JUNIORS (11)	3,201.85	1,521.05	236.17	-	-	4,959.07
SOPHOMORES (8)	291.00	3,418.92	-	-	-	3,709.92
FRESHMEN (6)	100.25	409.50	27.30	-	-	537.05
OTHER	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL (30)	<u>\$3,778.18</u>	<u>\$5,605.67</u>	<u>\$ 538.67</u>	<u>\$1,804.20</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>\$11,726.72</u>

High School Division
 New York City Board of Education
 110 Livingston Street
 Brooklyn, New York 11201

The City University of New York
 Division of Teacher Education
 33 West 42 Street
 New York, New York 10036

COLLEGE DISCOVERY AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE
 1967-68

1. I have been tutoring _____ High School.

2. List subject(s), grade(s), and number of students tutored.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Grade</u>	<u># of Students</u>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. How many students, on the average, did you tutor per session? _____

4. Did the students attend regularly as scheduled? Yes _____ No _____

Comments: _____

5. When did tutoring take place? (check all that apply)

During regular class periods _____

During study periods _____

During lunch periods _____

Before or after school hours _____

Other (explain) _____

6. Where did tutoring take place? (check all that apply)

Library _____

Cafeteria _____

Empty classroom _____

Office _____

Other (explain) _____

7. The tutoring sessions are usually devoted to the following:

(check all that apply)

Help with homework problems _____

Studying for examinations _____

Reviewing classwork _____

Introducing new work _____

Other (explain) _____

8. What materials did you use during the tutoring sessions?

(for example: textbooks, films, review books, etc.) _____

9. I was supervised by: _____

Supervision was: adequate _____ inadequate _____

Comments: _____

10. What contact did you have with the classroom teachers?

None _____ Some _____ A great deal _____

Comments: _____

11. Were you informed about what was being taught in the classroom? Yes ___ No ___

Did you have a copy of the textbook being used? Yes _____ No _____

Comments: _____

12. What were the reactions of the students you tutored? For example, were they enthusiastic or did they come because they "had to". Did they bring questions or wait for you to suggest something? Please comment honestly and fully. (use back of page if more space is needed)

13. What are your reactions to the tutoring program, to the students, etc.?

Please comment honestly and fully. (use back of page if more space is needed)

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

Date _____

Signature _____

Yours answers will be held in the strictest confidence by the CDD central staff.

If you wish to tutor again next semester notify this office of your free hours as early as possible. Thank you.